

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1 and 7 have been amended. Claims 1-9 are pending and under consideration.

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are now discussed. Using independent claim 1 as an example, this claim recites a main control module for controlling an action of the CTI control module in accordance with a predetermined interpretation scenario that includes a current state, a current state conversion action selected according to the event generated in the CTI module, and a basic telephone action to be executed at a next state.

Independent claim 1 also recites wherein the current state and the event relate to the translating by the interpretation module or a transmission of the translated voice.

The Examiner's attention is drawn to the present specification, page 9, lines 9-21. For the Examiner's clarification, and not to be interpreted as limiting the claims, it is noted that this portion of the specification teaches the actions which should be executed at the next stage in response to events generated at the current state are predetermined in the interpretation scenario. An advantage of this feature is that the actions to be performed at the next stages of the translation are defined beforehand, thereby resulting in smoother communication between speakers of different languages. The interpretation scenario is in the format of current state, event, action, as further illustrated in present figure 6.

The Examiner relies upon column 18, line 67 to column 21, line 65 of Nagai. This portion generally teaches the routing of messages according to different conditions, such as the contact state (operations 1003 and 1006 in FIG. 10), and the type of sending and receiving means (FIGS. 11-13). It appears that the Examiner construes conditions of Nagai as corresponding to the claimed events. For example, according to the Examiner's interpretation, the satisfaction of a contact condition (such as priority, sending means, sending source telephone number or address, date and contact content or not) corresponds to the "event" of present FIG. 6. The operation resulting from the contact condition would correspond to the "action" of present FIG. 6.

However, Nagai generally relates to contact states and sending/receiving means, whereas claim 1 recites a predetermined interpretation scenario that includes a current state, a current state conversion action, and a basic telephone action to be executed at a next state, *wherein the current state and the event relate to the translating by the interpretation module or a*

transmission of the translated voice. The interpretation module or transmission of the translated voice are clearly different from the satisfaction of a contact condition (such as priority, sending means, sending source telephone number or address, date and contact content or not) as taught in Nagai. None of these conditions relates to a translation or a transmission of the translation.

Furthermore, Nagai does not have a current state, event, action format for the interpretation scenario, as claimed. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that Nagai teaches some kind of current state, event, action format, such a format does not relate to an interpretation scenario. Instead, the relevant scenario is the contact condition, which does not correspond to the claimed interpretation scenario, as discussed above.

Thus, Nagai does not achieve the advantage of smooth translation, as achieved by the invention of claim 1. Instead, Nagai achieves a slower translation as compared with the invention of claim 1. This is because the invention of claim 1 teaches the actions which should be executed at the next stage in response to events generated at the current state are predetermined in the *interpretation scenario*.

The remaining references do not overcome these deficiencies. Wood is relied upon as teaching telephone actions being made in accordance with only one job unit. Kishinsky is relied upon as teaching the use of CTI control functions. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that Wood Kishinsky teach these features, this does not address the features of a current states or events relating to an interpretation operation or interpretation transmission operation.

Independent claim 7 is patentable over Nagai at least for similar reasons as discussed with respect to claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-4 and 8-9 are patentable over the cited references at least due to their dependence from their respective independent claims.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections as requested.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY-LLP

Date: 4-21-10

By: 

Michael J. Badagliacca
Registration No. 39,099

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501